

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED

08 MAY 13 AM 8:14
This space for
Clerk's Office File Stamp

TO: ☐ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
FROM: K. Hammerly, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 5/12/2008
CASE NO.: 07cv2388 DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff Fox DEPUTY
CASE TITLE: Fox v. United States of America
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Answer to Defts Reply Brief in Support There Motion to Dismiss Pltiffs Action

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/>	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/>	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<u>OTHER: No provisions for an 'Answer' to be filed. Surreply not allowed absent leave of Court.</u>

Date forwarded: 5/12/2008

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.
- Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☒ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Judge Sabraw

Dated: 5/12/08
cc: All Parties

By: nm

REJECTED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL FOX

PLAINTIFF

CASE NUMBER 07 CV 2388 DMS (POR)

VERSES

ANSWER TO DEFENDANTS REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT
THERE MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS ACTION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *et. al*

PLAINTIFFS BRIEF OF FACTS..

DEFENDANTS

NOW COMES MICHAEL FOX THE PLAINTIFF IN PRO PER AND STATES THE
BRIEF OF FACTS TO THIS HONORABLE COURT

1) DEFENDANTS CONTINUE TO LIVE IN THERE SELF-CENTERED WORLD OF DELUSIONAL DENIAL. DEFENDANTS CONTINUE TO ASK THIS COURT TO SAVE THE DEFENDANTS IN THERE GROSS MISCONDUCT IN HANDLING THIS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND ITS EXHIBITS.... CONTINUING TO STATE FALSE ALLEGATIONS, WHEN DEFENDANTS ARE IN DEFAULT..

1A) PLAINTIFF FILED A PETITION AND COMPLAINT WITH A HUGE AMOUNT OF EXHIBITS ON DEC 20 2008 IN THE FEDERAL COURT CLERKS OFFICE.

2) DEFENDANTS BEING SERVED DEC 28 2007 AND JAN 4 2008

2A) DEFENDANTS HAD UNTIL FEB 25 2008 TO ANSWER THIS PETITION AND COMPLAINT—

2B) ON FEB 26 2008 DEFENDANTS ASKED THE COURT FOR A EXTENSION OF TIME, DEFENDANTS STATING THEY NEED MORE TIME DUE TO THE COMPLEXITY OF THIS CASE, AND TO DO A GOOD AND THOROUGH JOB ANSWERING THE ISSUES. ALSO DUE TO 1ST AMENDED COMPLAINT WHICH GRANTS THE ADDITIONAL TIME TO FILE—WHICH HAS UTTERLY NO BEARING ON THIS ISSUE AT HAND.

3) THE COURT DENYING DEFENDANTS MOTION, FOR EXTENSION OF TIME AS IT IS MUTE.. ON MARCH 7 2008

4) PLAINTIFF FILES FOR DEFAULT JUDGEMENTS AND AN ANSWER TO JUDGE SABRAWS ORDER DENYING